Middle Years Programme	Form F3.1
Moderation coversheet: Subjects	

Please complete a copy of this form for **each** folder of work submitted for moderation.

Please ensure that the material being submitted for moderation conforms to the requirements set out in the relevant subject group guide. All the criteria **must be applied twice** within the folder accompanying this form, unless stated otherwise in the subject guide.

School name: VICTORIA SHANGHAI ACADEMY School code: 002634

Student's name/number: *Elizabeth KOT* Subject: MATHS (Extended)

The student's work is (please mark box):

☐ comparatively good ☑ average ☐ comparatively weak

Nature and title of assessment task		Criteria			
		A	B	C	D
1. **Summative Assessment (broad-based)**	Teacher	4		4	
	Moderator				
2. **Transformation**	Teacher			4	
	Moderator				
3. **Vectors and Matrices**	Teacher		4		2
	Moderator				
4. **AP, GP, exponential, logarithms**	Teacher	3			2
	Moderator				
5. **Probability and Sequences**	Teacher		2		
	Moderator				

Please use the reverse of this form or separate sheets to identify the conditions under which each piece of work was done (project, classroom test, end-of-term examination, and so on), the amount of support provided, any special circumstances, and general/specific information on the student. Provide any information that may assist the moderators in determining how the criteria were applied.

Name of teacher: *Kenneth So*

Signature of teacher: Date: *June 3, 2013*

Names of teachers involved in internal standardization for this subject:

Echo Li, Kenneth So, William Wong

Task	Criterion	Remarks
Summative Assessment (broad-based)	**A**	***Elizabeth performed well on some of the "simple" problems and on some of the "more complex" problems. She even failed to solve some "simple" questions, that is why I awarded a level 4 here.***
	C	***It was easy to follow Elizabeth's lines of reasoning, especially on question 6(a). All her answers are clear though not always logical and complete.***
Transformation	**C**	***Generally, Elizabeth correctly used the terminology, like "translate", "reflect" and "contract". Moreover, all her explanations were easily followed and understood.***
Vectors and Matrices	**B**	***In Part 1, Elizabeth demonstrated the perfect calculation in question (a) to (c), (g) to (i) and (k) to (m). However, she only had little success in recognizing the pattern in (d) and (f). Furthermore, she was unable to justify the pattern in (e) and (n). I believe that awarding her a level 4 would be appropriate.***
	D	***In part 2, Elizabeth failed to apply the vector to the real life problem and explain her deduction effectively and accurately. Except (a)(i) and part of (d), her relatively poor performance in all questions limited her to level 2.***
AP, GP, exponential, logarithms	**B**	***In question 1, Elizabeth successfully applied the data to the formula of A.P. and G.P. correctly in order to predict the mathematical model. Besides, she had little success in questions 2, 3, 6 and 7. However, she failed to come up with a correct model in question 1 and an unfamiliar model in question 6. It explains why she scores 3 only.***
	D	***Even though Elizabeth made a simple prediction of the mathematical model based on the findings by analyzing the data, the explanation was irrelevant. Except question 1, she failed to use the model found in question 1 to do the predictions and comparison for rest of the question.***
Probability and Sequences	**B**	***Elizabeth was awarded a level 2 because she was able to select and apply the mathematical problem solving technique of a tree diagram to answer the early question and reveal the pattern "that each time the probability is multiplied by ½" which she demonstrated by comparing the answers in questions 2 and 3. Elizabeth was awarded the 2 where Cindy was not because of this demonstration of understanding. However, she failed to define this as a general mathematical rule based on a, b, and N.***

Teacher's comments: